

have had a 2-hour birth and a mother who has been through 12 hours or 18 hours and had an extremely painful, exhausting, debilitating birth. They make no distinction whatsoever between the two; just out of here in 24 hours.

Their rules do not distinguish between an experienced mother, a mother perhaps having her third or fourth child with a father or a grandmother at home ready to help, ready to help the mother, ready to help the child, on the one hand, and then on the other hand, a 16-year-old teenage mother with an exhausting birth process who is discharged after virtually no time. A teenage mother, who is terrified at the prospect and has no idea of how to care for a healthy baby, much less a baby showing some kinds of symptoms which that 16-year-old teenage mother cannot understand. It makes no difference to the insurance company. The circumstances make no difference: 24 hours, they must all be discharged from the hospital, period.

How do we get here? I mean, this is the great debate. The Clinton health care bill did not pass, I understand that. It tried to bite off too much, I understand that. The free market is working, I understand that, but there are some very dangerous things going on. Some of the most unhappy people in America right now, and the ones most worried about quality of care, are physicians.

Judith Bowman is a first-time mom from Fairmont, WV. She recently experienced one of these speedy discharges. She wrote to me:

"I was surprised by the almost drive-thru like approach put on bringing a precious new life into the world. The information concerning the baby and personal follow up care comes fast."

"I was," she said, "exhausted. I couldn't understand it all. It was new to me. I couldn't take it all in. I was still recovering from the birth experience."

"The total length of my stay after delivery was approximately 20 hours."

Mr. President, in concluding, I say that one would hope that the Congress would not need to legislate on this kind of matter. I mean, to be quite honest with you, I think it is rather shocking. It is the kind of thing that you think that the private sector would pick up immediately at the first sense of difficulties and simply stop. But, no—insurance companies are motivated by other things.

I would think that we could trust insurance companies to do the right thing on an individual case-by-case basis. What is so strange about that? What is so radical about that? To let doctors make patient-care decisions without concern of financial or other penalties being imposed on them.

Of course, what I am saying is, if doctors who belong to HMOs want to keep the mother more than 24 hours, they may be threatened, saying, "You either start discharging after 24 hours or

you're off our payroll." Do not think for a moment that is not happening. It is scary. It is scary.

So this bill would require insurers to pay for a 48-hour stay following an uncomplicated vaginal delivery and 96 hours for an uncomplicated Caesarean section. The bill permits, as Senator BRADLEY said, shorter stays. But, again, it puts the decision in the hands of the physician of the mother to decide if that is appropriate. That is who should make this critical decision, not an insurance company driven by other considerations, including those of their stockholders.

Mr. President, I conclude my remarks simply by thanking Senator BRADLEY and Senator KASSEBAUM for leading this effort. I again hope we will be able to take this matter up somewhere around Mother's Day. I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

GAS TAX REPEAL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I believe that we should not have a roll-back of the 4.3-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax. Actually, retention of this tax is the sensible, national interest course to follow as we struggle to reduce the deficit. I fear that, like Sisyphus in Hades, we are doomed forever to roll the heavy stone of the deficit uphill, only to have it always roll down again, weighted down by yet another quick-fix tax cut.

In our effort to reduce the deficit, we grapple daily with the stark reality that funds for education, the environment, Medicare, and the earned income tax credit, are all being scaled back. And now, a clarion call to lower the gas tax is being heard. Repealing the gas tax is projected to save the average motorist the grand total of about \$27 a year in taxes. Note too, there is no certainty that the oil companies will actually pass this rebate on to the consumer. The effect of this gesture is to reduce revenues by \$4.8 billion, thereby making it all the more difficult to reduce the Federal deficit.

While I recognize that higher gas prices effectively reduce the take home pay of commuters and those whose daily livelihood depends upon the availability of low priced fuel, gasoline in the United States has become one of the "great bargains of the Western world" to quote Daniel Yergin in today's New York Times. Over the last few years, prices, adjusted for inflation, have been as low as at any time since World War II. The price of about \$1.30 a gallon is exquisitely cheap when compared with the almost \$5 a gallon paid in France.

Rather than providing a potentially illusory benefit of \$27 per motorist, I suggest we concentrate on those issues having a far more profound impact on the lives of working Americans. We have yet to satisfactorily grapple with proposals to increase the minimum

wage, the projected shortfall in Medicare funds in 2001, and the fact that our education programs are such that the mathematics scores of some of our students, particularly in the Southeast region, continue to be lamentably low. Repealing the gasoline tax is the last thing we should think of doing—and we should quickly reject the idea.

WELCOMING U.S. DECISION TO PARTICIPATE IN EXPO '98 IN LISBON

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on another matter, last month, the White House announced that it has accepted an invitation from the Portuguese Government to participate in the international exposition to be held in Lisbon in 1998. This is good news indeed. I commend President Clinton for this decision.

I have long encouraged the administration to take this step. Last year, I sponsored a resolution calling for U.S. participation in Expo '98. In March of this year, I visited the site of the expo while in Lisbon for President Sampaio's inauguration. During my visit, I took the opportunity to learn in detail the goals and themes of the expo from Antonio Cardoso Cunha, commissioner-general and chairman of Expo '98.

Earlier this week, we welcomed Portuguese Foreign Minister Jaime Gama to Washington. Accordingly, I believe it is a particular appropriate time to bring Expo '98 to the attention of my colleagues and to express my enthusiasm for working with our Portuguese allies on this important project.

The theme of Expo '98 appropriately, will be "The Oceans, a Heritage for the Future" and will focus on environmental topics. As the resident of a coastal State which shares with Portugal a rich maritime tradition, I cannot imagine a more appropriate or more unifying theme. The U.N. General Assembly has declared 1998 as the International Year of the Ocean in an effort to alert the world to the need to improve the physical and cultural assets of the world's oceans. A fundamental goal of Expo '98 will be to focus on the growing importance of the world's oceans and to foster a debate on the sustainable use of marine resources and environmental protection. The United States, of course, has a vested interest in being part of this debate.

Our participation in this exposition, which marks the 500th anniversary of the historic voyage from Europe to India of the Portuguese explorer Vasco da Gama, should be a source of pride for those of Portuguese heritage, as well as a source of great interest for all those with a concern for the oceans and a sense of history. Portugal, of course, has a great history of sea exploration, and in fact, helped to create important trade links between the peoples of Europe, the Americas, Africa, and Asia. Lisbon, the capital of Portugal since the 12th century, is a vibrant cultural